

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,555	06/27/2005	Maurice Baker		7108
60333 EDWIN D. SC	7590 11/02/2007	EXAMINER		
FIVE HIRSCH	AVENUE		GORDON, STEPHEN T	
P.O. BOX 966 CORAM, NY 11727-0966			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			MAILDATE	DELIVERT MODE
			11/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/534,555	BAKER, MAURICE		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Stephen Gordon	3612		
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTO WHICHEVER IS LONGER - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mai - If NO period for reply is specified ab - Failure to reply within the set or exte	FROM THE MAILING DA e under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ling date of this communication. ove, the maximum statutory period we ended period for reply will, by statute, er than three months after the mailing	'IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (16(a)). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDON date of this communication, even if timely fill	DN.  Imply filed  m the mailing date of this communication.  IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
	2b)☐ This is in condition for allowar	eptember 2007. action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, p ax parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4			
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) 13-29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s) 25-29 is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 13-24 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
<ul> <li>9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTC 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent 3) Information Disclosure Statemer Paper No(s)/Mail Date  S. Palent and Trademark Office	Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:			

Application/Control Number: 10/534,555 Page 2

Art Unit: 3612

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains the term "means" (i.e. legal phraseology) throughout. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. Claims 13-24, as newly amended/presented are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly

claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 as newly amended, "said pallet" in both lines 9 and 11 (2 places total) lacks

clear antecedent basis as pallets per se are previously recited in line 1 and line 8.

Claim 15, note the terms "said pallet" on line 3 (2 places) and line 6 (i.e. 3 places total)

lack clear antecedent basis in view of the confusing language noted above regarding

base claim 13. Note similar confusing terms in claim 18 – line 4, claim 19 – line 3, and

claim 21 - line 3, claim 22 - both lines 4 and 6.

Claim 21, the recited locking means on line 2 is confusing as it is not clear if/how such

relates back to the locking means of the base claim. Such term appears to be a double

inclusion of the locking means of claim 13.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

States.

Art Unit: 3612

4. Claims 13-14, 18 and 24, as best understood and as newly amended/presented, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pavlik '826.

Note pallet 10, chassis 12,14+, locomotion means/rollers 40, and locking means 89,90+ as broadly claimed.

Regarding the newly added language to claim 13, the locking means is engagable to a container wall (e.g. a container bottom wall) or an adjacent pallet (e.g. a top side of a lower adjacent pallet) as newly broadly claimed and as best understood. Note also, in as much as a container or adjacent pallet per se are not positively recited elements of the instant claimed combination, the functional/positional language relating thereto is given little patentable weight.

Claim 14, note roller at 79,81.

Claim 18 note first locking means 89,90+ and second locking means 79+ as broadly claimed and as best understood. Note also element 106+ defines an additional locking means as broadly claimed. The locking means define a locking device as newly broadly claimed and as best understood.

Claim 24, the device is configured as newly broadly claimed and as best understood.

5. Claims 13-14, 18, 21, and 24, as best understood and as newly amended/presented, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seo '365.

Note pallet (figure 1 embodiment), locomotion means/lower rollers, and locking means (including the side rollers) as broadly claimed.

Art Unit: 3612

Regarding the newly added language to claim 13, the locking means is engagable to a container wall or an adjacent pallet as newly broadly claimed and as best understood. Note also, in as much as a container or adjacent pallet per se are not positively recited elements of the instant claimed combination, the functional/positional language relating thereto is given little patentable weight.

Claim 18, note the side rollers define second locking means and the element at reference 20 or 20' defines first locking means as broadly claimed. The locking means define a locking device as newly broadly claimed and as best understood.

Claim 21, the other element 20 or 20' on the trailing edge of the pallet reads on the locking device. Note extensible member 43+ is movable into close abutment as broadly claimed and as best understood. Note also, in as much as the rear door per se is not a positively recited element of the instant claimed combination, the functional /positional language relating thereto is given little patentable weight.

. Claim 24, the device is configured as newly broadly claimed and as best understood.

- 6. Claims 15-17, 19-20, and 22-23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. Claims 25-29 are allowed.
- 8. Applicant's arguments filed 9-12-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Application/Control Number: 10/534,555

Art Unit: 3612

Regarding applicant's comments directed to the Pavlik reference, the following should be noted. While it may be that the locking mechanism of Pavlik is attached to an underside of the pallet structure, such is deemed readable on the newly added language of claim 13 as best understood. It should be noted, in as much as multiple pallets are recited in new claim 13, it is not entirely clear as to which pallet (i.e. the pallet for use with a container or the adjacent pallet) the terms "the pallet" at the end of the claim refer – thus making application of the prior art difficult. Note a pallet "edge", as broadly defined, does not preclude a reading of the locking mechanism of Pavlik as being so located. Clearly the Pavlik locking mechanism is in an edge region, and no specific structure in the claim language precludes fairly reading the mechanism as being located at an "edge" as such.

Regarding applicant's comments directed toward the Seo reference, the following should be noted. To the extent that the relied upon locking means of Seo would serve at least to some degree to immobilize the pallet in certain directions, such is deemed fairly readable on the locking device as broadly recited and as best understood.

In general it should be noted, clearly applicant's invention as disclosed is different than the relied upon prior art patents. Moreover, applicant's newly amended claims 13+ as best understood appear to be *beginning* to move away from the teachings of the prior art and very likely toward additional patentable material beyond that which has already been indicated as allowable. The instant claims however, as currently presented,

Art Unit: 3612

remain sufficiently broad that application of the prior art under 35USC section 102 as detailed above is deemed warranted.

Page 6

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gordon whose telephone number is (571) 272-6661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/534,555

Art Unit: 3612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stephen Gordon

Page 7

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3612

stg